United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPENDIX

76-1099

To be argued by JONATHAN J. SILBERMANN

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Appellee,

-against-

ERASMUS FLECHA,

Defendant-Appellant.

AS

Docket No. 76-1099

APPENDIX TO APPELLANT'S BRIEF

ON APPEAL FROM A JUDGMENT SET PUSARO, CURRY OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT CONSTONE CIRCUIT

WILLIAM J. GALLACHER, ESQ.,
THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY,
Attorney for Appellant
ERASMUS FLECHA
FEDERAL DEFENDER SERVICES UNIT
509 United States Court House
Foley Square
New York, New York 10007
(212) 732-2971

JONATHAN J. SILBERMANN,
Of Counsel.

E bran	DOCKET	730	K	39]	ľ		WEIN	STEI	N,	J.
	T	TLE OF CASE			AT C	ern	ATTORNE	YS		j: ''
	THE I	UNITED STAT	TES			Corat &				1
		vs.	,		- Contract	AUSA-	T.R. 1	PATTT	SON	
	× Jose	ANCISAR	PINEDA-M	ARIN,						
		SUAREZ				* /		•		
	XMOISI	ES BANGUE	RA,							
	XERNES	STO SANTO	GONZALE	EZ	***					
	ERASI	MUS FLECHA			For Defendant: HICO SHAREZ.					
7			•			Court appointed counsel:				
						David W		-		<u>·</u>
						1527 F	-		3	
		-				Mineol	a, NY	11501	- 建构	
Did im	port into USA wi	th inten	t to dis	cribute	marih	iana 120x				1
			1							
ABS	TRACT OF COSTS	AMOUNT	1	 	NAME	EIVED AND DISBU	RECEIVE		DISBUR	SED
Fine,	FLECKA) F	300000	10/26/73	Natice		(Svarez)		-	T	-
Clerk,	,	1	IUIZEII.	Conficer	1) ofer				$\neg \uparrow$	
Marshal,		 	1/8/23	Telia	2016	(1/2)		\dashv		
Attorney,			19/9/2	- C	10-1900	(Jugar)		-		
Commission	er's Court		1/2/-	301	100	16.17	.,	-	\neg	
Witnesses,		 	977/75	LALL	garage	1 speeds were	7	_		
7 111100000		 	1/27/10	7.1	re J	1/2 /2		_		
			1/2//16	Mille	TEFFERE	1 6 C				
		 	1	+	FLECHA)		12.		
			1	 				-	-	
	*		1		·					
DATE				PROCEEDING	s					
4-17-73	Before BARTELS	J - Sup	erseding	Indict	ment fi	iled.			==	
4/19/73	Pefore WEINSTH						esent	-A11	def	S
	arraigned and					A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR		the latest several property of	-	
	cont'd as to a		transmission and the same of the same of							
•	is granted-Def									fa1
4/24/73	Eefore WEINSTE								-	
1	motion to supp									S
	motion to supp								and in column 2 is not a local	-
4/25/13	Before WEINST									g
	ordered and b									
i	exhibit #6 and								<u> </u>	
	not for others									
	for trial.			- B Cont						
Control of the last of the las	The state of the second	-				and the same of th				

-	
DATE,	PROCEEDINGS
4/25/73	
4/26/73	Before WEINSTEIN, J. Case called Def's and counsel present Trial ordered
-	and begun-Jurors selected and sworn Trial contid to 4/27/73
4-27-7	
	Trial resumed - trail continued to April 30, 1973.
4/30/73	- Traine
-	Trial cont'd to 5/1/73 at 10:30 A.M.
5/1/73	Before WEINSTEIN, J Case called-Defts and counsel present-Trial resumed
-	Govt rests-Motion by deft SUAREZ to discharge jurora #4 is granted-Defts
	motion for mistrial isdenied- Motion by deft MARIN to dismiss the indict
	is denied-Motion by deft BONGUERA to dismiss cts. 1 and 2 are granted and
	as to ct. 3-Motion by deft GONZALEZ to dismiss the indectment is greated-
4	by deft FLECHA to dismiss the indictment is denied-All defts rest-All def
	motions previously made are renewed and denied-All counsels sum up for th
	spective defts individually-Mr. Pattison sums up for govtCourt charges
	Jury retires to deliberate at 5:45 P.MHearing on defts motion to suppre
	resumes-Trial cont'd to 5/2/73 at 2:00 P.M.
5/1/73	By WEINSTEIN, J Order of Sustenance filed.
5/2/73	Stenographer's transcript XX pp. 83-607 filed.
5/2/73	Before WEINSTEIN, J Case called- Defts and counsels present-Trial re-
	sumed-Jury resumes deliberation at 2:00 P.MJury returns and renders a
	verdict of guilty as to cts. 1,2 and 3 as to defts MARIN, SUALEZ, GONZALE
	and FLECHA and guilty as to ct. 3 as to deft BANGUERA-Application by deft
	PINEDA for release pending bail is denied-Case adjd to 5/4/73 at 10:00 A.
	for motions and possible sentences-Govt's application to raise the bail of
	defts FLECHA and GONZALEZ is denied.
5/2/73	By WEINSTEIN, J Order of Sustenance filed.
5-3-73	Envelope ordered sealed and placed in vault by Judge Weinstein.
5/4/73	Before WEINSTEIN, J Case called- Defts and counsel present- Defts motio
•	immediate sentence without sentencing reports is denied-Defts motions res
577.77	until day of sentence-Sentence adjd without date.
5/4/73	Stenographer's transcript of5/2/73 filed.
3/8/73	By CATOSSIO, INC. Order of Acceptance of Cash& Bail filed. (A. MAPOLI)
5/3/73	
7-26-73	Voucher for Expert Services filed. Letter from chambers filed- re:voucher for expert services Before WEINSTEIN J - Case called - deft MOISES BANGUERA present- counsel
	1not present - sentence adjd to July 31, 1973. Deft FLECHA not present -
	counsel I. Novis present - deft reportedin the hospital - sentence adjd to-
	August 1, 1973 in Brooklyn at 10:00 am . Deft HUGO SUAREZ & counsel D.McCa

DATE	PROCEEDINGS					
	present. Defts motion to set aside the verdict is denied - deft					
	sentenced to 4 years imprisonment plus 3 year special parole					
	term on each of counts 1, 2 &3 to run concurrently. Deft PINEDA-MARIN					
	sentenced to imprisonment for 4 years plus 3 year special parole					
	term on each of counts 1, 2 & 3 to run concurrently. Deft SANTO					
-	GONZALEZ & counsel J. Iovine By Mr. Horlick present - deft					
•	sentenced to imprisonment for 5 years plus 5 years special parole					
	on each of counts 1, 2 &3 to run concurrently - Stay of exection					
<u> </u>	granted to August 9, 1973.					
7-26-73	Judgment & Commitment filed - certified copies to Marshal					
	(defts. GONZALEZ, PINEDA-MARIN & HUGU SUAREZ.)					
7/31/73	Before, WEINSTEIN, J Case called - Deft and counsel Mr. Halliman					
	present- Marganita Mensa sworn in as interpreter- Defts motion					
	to retry the case on the basis of new evidence- Decision reserved					
	Deft sentenced to 2 years imprisonment and 10 years special parole					
	with directive that the deft be transported and incarcerated as if					
	the sentence was under Y.C.A. (MOISES BANGUERA)					
7/31/73	Judgment and Commitment filed- Certified copies to Marshal (BANGUERA)					
8/1/73	Before, WEINSTEIN, J Case called - Deft in hospital and letter dated					
	7/26/73 from U.S. Marshal, E.D.N.Y. marked(courts ex.1)					
	Case adjd to 9/14/73 at 9:30 A.M.					
8-3-73	Notice of Appeal filed (PINEDA-MARIN) no fee (and deft SUAREZ)					
8-3-73	Docket entries and duplicate of Notice mailed to C A (PINEDA-MARIN)					
	and deft (SUAREZ)					
8/6/73	Letter received from chambers from Atty Jay Honlick filed re: GONZALES					
8/6/73	Judgment and Commitment retd and filed. Exeuctedd. Defts SUAREZ, BAN-					
	GUERA, PINEDA-MARIN filed.					
8-8-73	Notice of Motion filed, ret. 9-4-73, as to deft Banguera					
	for vacating the verdict and judgment or in lieu of that a hearing					
	on the question of whether or not the Govt has complied with					
-	its obligation, etc.					
88-73	Before Weinstein J - Case called on application for stay of					
	surrender pending appeal (deft Gonzalez) application granted					
•	pending appeal - bail \$10,000 contd - deft to report once a					
	week to Asst U.S. Atty. Pattison.					
8-8-73	Notice of Appeal filed without fee (KANGUERA) So Ordered by Weinstein, J.					
8-8-73	Docket entries and duplicate of Notice mailed to C of A (BANGUERA)					

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
8/9/73	K¾ Petitionfor Writ of Habeas Co pus Ad Testificandum filed. (KOCH)
8/9/73	By MISHLER, CH.J Writ issued, ret. 10/10/73
8/10/73	By, WEINSTEIN, J Ordered that the argument will be heard on 9/21/73 at
	10:15 A.M. (AUSA and counsel notified as ordered) (BANGUERA)
8/14/7	3 Govt's affadavit in opposition filed (BANGUERA)
8/3/73	Notice of Appeal filed.
8/3/73	Duplicate of Notice of Appeal and docket entries mailed to the C. of A. (DEFT GONZALEZ)
9/4/73	Stenographers Transcript dated 7/26/73 filed
9-4-73 9/12/7 9/13/7	
3/23/1.	Appeals
9/14/73	.Before WEINSTEIN, J Cse called - Deft FLECHA and counsel pot present-Benc
	Warrant ordered-Sentence set for Sept. 17, 1973
9-17-73	Before WEINSTEIN J - Case called - Deft FLECHA not present - reported a fugiti ve - deft sentenced in absentia to imprisonment for 5 years
	plus parole of 2 years and fined \$15,000 on each of counts 1 and 2 to
	run concurrently and sentenced to imprisonment for a period of 5 years
•	plus special parole of 2 years and fined \$15,000 on count 3, to run
	consecutively with counts 1 and 2 for a total fine of \$30,000. the
	2 years special parole term on count 3 is to run concurrently with the 2 years special parole term imposed on counts 1 and 2 - defts motion
	for bail pending appeal is denied - govts motion for forfeiture of bail is granted.
0 17 72	Judgment and Commitment filed - certified copies to Marshal (FLECHA)
9-17-	
9-17	
9/18/73	Bench Warrant issued (FLECHA)
9/18/7	是这种的时候,我们就是一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个
	appeal (PINEDA-MARIN AND ERNESTO GONZALEZ)
9-18-73	
9:/24/7	C of A (MARIN & GONZALEZ) 3 Acknowledgment received from Court of Appeals and filed for record on
	appeal (PINEDA-MARIN AND GONZALEZ)
9/21/73	Before WEINSTEIN. J Case called - Deft Banguera not present - Deft's couns
	present - Post Trial Brady motion argued - Decision reserved - Briefs to be
-	submitted within 2 weeks for govt

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
10/1/73	Notice of appeal filed (FLECHA)
10/1/73	Docket entries and duplicate of Notice of Appeal mailed to court of
	appeals (FLECHA)
19/2/73	Writ retd and filed- Executed (FLECHA)
10/2/73	Certified copy of Judgment and Commitment retd and filed- Deft delivered
	to Federal Detention Headquarters (FLECHA)
10/2/73	Stenographers Transcript dated April 19, 1973 filed & 4-13-73
10/2/7	3 Stenographers Transcript dated May 4, 1973 and July 26, 1973/filed
10-3-7	3 Voucher for Expert Services filed (Hugo Suarez)
10-9-73	
10-9-73	Copy of Govts affidavit in oppositon filed. (Flecha)
10-9-73	Before WEINSTEIN J - Case called - motion by all defts for an
	order vacating the verdict and Judgment, etc. Hearing set for
	Oct. 16, 1973.
10/10/73	By WEINSTEIN, J Order filed approving cf late filing of notice of
	appeal for deft Erasmus Flecha - and letter from Atty Irving Novis filed
10/12/7	
10/14/3	Voude In Compens when of Cornel fle (I lecha)
F10/16/	1 // + // /
	defts not present- All counsels present- Defts motion for a new
•	trial- Hearing ordered and begun- Name of informant ordered sealed
	and placed in vault- Court rules that informants name need not be
	revealed- Hearing concluded- Defts motion for a new trial denied-
	Mr. Hallinan to file notice of appeal in 66rma pauperis for Deft
	Banguera
10-15-73	
	FLECHA in the amount of \$5,000 filed by Ruben Pacheo is
-	declared forfeited.
10/16/7	3 Notice of appeal filed (for order meying defts motion for a new trial)
	(Pineda-marin)
10/16/7	3 Docket eentries and duplicate of Notice of appeal mailed to C of A
	(Pineda-Marin)
10/16/7	3, By WEINSTEIN, J, - Order filed authorizing voucher for expert services
	(PINEDA-MARIN)
10-23-73	Notice of Appeal filed (MOISES BANGUERA) (from order denying new trial)
10-23-73	Notice of Apeal filed (SANTO GONZALEZ) " " " "
10-23-73	Docket entries and duplicate of Notice mailed to C of A for defts
	BANGEERA & SANTO GONZALEZ.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
10/24/7	3 Letter dated 10/19/73 from Lawrence Spirn, esq. and letter dated 10/19/
	from William Epstein, esq. filed re: ruling on suppression hearing-
10/24/7	
	stated in letters from L. Spirn and W. Epstein, esqs. on 11/9/73, Couns
	will make available all documents pertinent to proceedings (counsels notified as ordered) (Order on bootm of letters)
25-73	Stenographers transcript dated Oct. 16, 1973 filed (Marin)
10-25-7	Noucher for Expert Services filed (Pineda-Marin)
10/26/7	3 Notice of appeal from order denying new trial filed (SUAREZ)
10/26/7	
	(SUAREZ)
11/5/73	Stenographers Transcript dated 4/26/73 filed
11-5-73	
	Vanquera (received from Chambers)
11-5-73	By Weinstein J - Order filed that Clerk of Court will send required form
	etc. Form sent to Judge Weinstein for signing.
11-9-73	
	Conference for further information as to wire-tap issue held and
	concluded - Hearing set for Nov. 20, 1973 at 9:45 am.
11-13-	3 By WEINSTEIN J - Memorandum and Order filed re transcripts, etc.
	Pages of the transcript (as indicated in Memo) shall be made available
	to attorneys for defts, either by opening them for inspection or by
	supplying xerox copies. Clerk to notify attys and send a copy of Memo
	and Order (parties notified)
11-16-	73 Voucher for expert services filed (SUAREZ)
	3 Voucher for expert services filed (PINEDA-MARIN)
	73 Before WEINSTEIN J - Case called - hearing to set aside verdict-Agents
*iex	ryx Terreex called xand swarm xas x witness x for x cour - hearing concluded-
	defts motion to set aside the verdict is denied. So Ordered.
11/23/7	3 Voucher for Compensation filed (for deft H. Suarez)
11-28-	73 Notice of motion for reduction of sentence filed (Pineda-Marin) (Pro Se
11-28-	
	motion for a reduction of sentence (copy sent to deft as ordered)
12-17-7	
	Chambers from Administrative Office and copy of voucher filed
112-26-	
12-26-	
12-25-	to a contract to the state of t
1=7-4	

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
	and some stand from Chambers re
1-7-74	Memorandum dated Dec. 28, 1973 filed received from Chambers re deft Flecha (from Robert Lipscher of the C of A re CJA #20etc)
1-9-74	Brief for deft. HUGO SUAREZ filed.
1-9-74	Writ retd and filed - Executed. (FLECHA)
1-9-74	Before WEINSTEIN J - case called on motion for weduction of
	sentence as to deft. FLECHA -motion granted - deft sentenced to 4 years and 2 years/probation.
1-9-74	Amended Judgment and Order of Probation filed - certified
1-9-14	copies to Marshal and probation.
1 15 7/	Certified copy of Juigment & Commitment retd and filed -
1-15-74	deft FLECHA del. to Federal Detention Headquarters.
1-16-75	Voucher for payment of counsel filed (FLECHA)
	2nd Supplemental Index to Record on Appeal handed to S.Sadowitz
1-17-74	of Legal Aid for delivery to the C of A (PINEDA-MARIN)
1-21-74	Acknowledgment received from the Court of Appeals for receipt
	of Index to Second Supplemental Record on Appeal (PINEDA-MARIN)
2-14-74	Judgment received from the C of A filed withdrawing appeal
	as to deft ERASMUS FLECHA.
3-28-74	Certified copy of Judgment received from court of appeals affirming
	the orders and judgments of the district court (JN)
4-11-7	
4-11-74	
	Rule 35 (Pineda-Marin) will be heard on April 26, 1974
4-26-7	at 9:30 am . The deft shall not be produced - (parties notified) Before WEINSTEIN J - case called - deft Pineda Marin not
	present - counsel Joanna Sevbert of Legal Aid present - defts motion
	for reduction of sentence - motion denied - so Ordered.
6-3-74	Record on appeal received from court of appeals- acknowledgment mailed
	mailed to court of appeals for receipt of file
6-24-74	Voucher for compensation of coursel filed (FLECHA)
6-28-74	Order received from Surreme Court and filed denying deft Suarez's
	petition for a writ of certiorari
7-15-74	Notice of motion filed for reduction of sentence impost. (Sugret)
~ 00 Th	
7-22-74	Before WEINSTEIN, J Case called - Deft not present - Counsel present - Kotion for reduction of sentence argued and denied - So Ordered (SUAREZ)
	(OVER)
	(OVER)

-					
DATE	PROCEEDINGS				
-25-74	By WEINSTEIN, J Order of forfeiture and judgment filed that the bail bond				
	of deft ERASMUS FLECHA, in the amount of \$5,000 is declared forfeited-				
	Ordered that judgment be entered in favor of the U.S. against the deft				
	Flecha and against Ruben Pachco as surety, Ordered that the clark of the co				
•	pay out of the Registry of this court any cash deposited in the Registry,				
	in accordance with the appearance bonl, êtc.				
8-1-74	Amended Order of Forfeiture and Judgment filed (ELECHA)				
8-7-74	Notice of Appeal filed as to deft Suarez from denial of motion				
	for reduction of sentence.				
8-7-74	Docket entries and duplicate of Notice mailed to the C of A(SUAREZ)				
9-6-74	Certified copy of Judgment and Commitment retd and filed- deft delivered				
	to Federal Detention Headquarters(GONZALEZ)				
11/11/74					
	deft GONZALEZ'S petition for certiorari				
12/27/74					
12/27/74	Copy of letter to deft Gonzalez from Law Clerk of Judge Weinstein filed re:above motion				
1-22-75	Govts affidavit filed in response to motion of deft Gonzalez for				
	reduction of sentence (forwarded to Chambers)				
1-30-	75 Order received from the Court of Appeals that the appeal from				
	the Judgment of the U.S. District Court is dismissed (Suarez)				
12/10/75					
11./03/7	Stato trapher's this isorbol of 9/17/73 fflied.				
1/23/76	Before WEINSTEIN, J Case called- deft FLECHA and counsel Edward Kelly				
	of Legal Aid present- The conviction having been set aside (75C1772) - deft				
	is sentenced to imprisonment for a period of 4 years and a special parole				
	term of 2 years- credit to be given for time served				
1/23/76	Judgment and Commitment filed- certified copies to Marshal				
1-27-7					
1-27-7					
	(Flecha)				
•					
	A TRUE COLL				
	DATE - 7/1-2				
	BY CAC Shirt BEST COPY AVAILABLE				
	BY clair thick, BEST CUPT AVAILABLE				

, and

EJB: TRP:cd F.#731720

> UNITED STATES DISTRICT QURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

.

IN CLERK'S OFFICE

S. S. DISTRICT COURT E.D. N.Y.

APR 1 7 1973

-XTIME A.M.....P.M.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

-against-

JOSE ANCISAR PINEDA-MARIN, HUGO SUAREZ, MOISES BANGUERA, ERNESTO SANTO GONZALEZ, ERASMUS FLECHA. SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT

Cr. No. (T. 21, U.S.C. §952(a), 960(a)(1), §963 and 844 841(a)(1); T. 18, U.S.C §2.)

Defendants.

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES:

73 CR 391

COUNT ONE

On or about and between the 25th day of March, 1973 and the 26th day of March, 1973, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York, the defendants JOSE ANCISAR PINEDA-MARIN, HUGO SUAREZ, MOISES BANGUERA, ERNESTO SANTO GONZALEZ, and ERASMUS FLECHA, did knowingly and intentionally import approximately two hundred eighty seven (287) pounds of marihuana, a Schedule I controlled substance, into the United States from Colombia, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 960(a)(1), and 952(a), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

COUNT TWO

On or about and between the 25th day of March, 1973, and the 26th day of March, 1973, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York, the defendants JOSE ANCISAR PINEDA-MARIN, HUGO SUAREZ, MOISES BANGUERA, ERNESTO SANTO GONZALEZ, and ERASMUS FLECHA, did knowingly and unlawfully possess with intent to distribute approximately two hundred eighty seven (287) pounds of marihuana, a Schedule I controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(a)(1) and Title 18 United States Code, Section 2.

COUNT THREE

On or about and between the 25th day of March, 1973 and the 26th day of March, 1973, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York, the defendants JOSE ANCISAR PINEDA-MARIN, HUGO SUAREZ, MOISES BANGUERA, ERNESTO SANTO GONZALEZ, and ERASMUS FLECHA, knowingly, unlawfully and intentionally did conspire to import into the United States from Columbia approximately two hundred eighty seven (287) pounds of marihuana, a Schedule I controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 952 and 960(a)(1), and to knowingly and intentionally possess with intent to distribute approximately two hundred eighty seven (287) pounds of marihuana, a Schedule I controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(a)(1), all in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 963 and 846.

A TRUE BILL.

FOREMAN.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

CHARGE OF THE COURT

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury:

It is my function now to instruct

You with respect to matters of the law.

It is your duty as jurors to follow these
instructions. You are the sole judges of
the facts. The fact that the prosecution was
brought in the name of the United States does
not entitle the government to any greater consideration than any other litigant is entitled
to get. Nobody is entitled to sympathy or favor
in this court.

Remember, I told you an indictment is merely a matter of bringing a case before the Court, it is not evidence of guilt, and is entitled to no weight at all in your determination. These defendants have pleaded not guilty, and that means the government has the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt with respect to every element of the crime each defendant is charged with committing. A defendant does not have to prove his innocence. A defendant need not submit any

evidence at all. On the contrary, he is presumed to be innocent. A defendant need not testify because of this same reason.

No inference adverse to a defendant may be made because he does not testify. He is presumed to be innocent and the government has the burden of proving him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. A presumption of innocence is a meaningful and substantial right which is afforded to every defendant in a criminal prosecution. This presumption of innocence remains with a defendant throughout the trial, and is to be considered by you in your deliberations.

A reasonable doubt means a doubt sufficient to cause a prudent person to hesitate to act in the most important affairs of his life. Reasonable doubt may result from the evidence produced, and may also result from the failure to produce evidence.

Finding a person to be guilty of a felory, and subjecting him to the possibility of serious penalties, is quite serious, as you will understand. You will consider the

~17

seriousness of the possibilities here in determining whether you have a resonable doubt. Nevertheless, if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt, you should not be swayed by sympathy, but you should find him guilty.

The law does not require certainty, because only those present at an event can feel certain about what happened, and even they can be wrong.

Of course, none of us, you or I or the attorneys, were present.

I use the phrase, "find beyond a reasonable doubt." Sometimes I just use the word, "find," but I want you to know that wherever I say, "find," it means "beyond a reasonable doubt."

You are going to have to rely upon your own common sense and experience in evaluating what you are told about and what you see in the way of exhibits here. A number of exhibits or a number of witnesses is not necessarily determinative of the truth.

Your recollection will govern, but if you have any questions about specific testimony,

or about specific evidence, you can send in a note and I will send in whatever you like. Try to be precise, if you want testimony reread. I do not want to waste a lot of time rereading unnecessary testimony.

Each of these four defendants is charged with three counts, or crimes, except for one of them. That one is charged only with one count. That is Banguera.

Each count must be separately considered by you with respect to each defendant, so in effect, there are 13 separate trials being considered here. You can find any defendant guilty or not guilty of any particular charge. Each one of these defendants, each charge has to be considered separately.

Now, with respect to a situation where more than one person may be involved, the guilt of the defendant may be established without proof that he personally did any act constituting the offense charged.

Eighteen United States Code, Section 2, provides:

5

•

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal."

That is if he did everything else.

"Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which is directly performed by him or another, would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal."

In other words, every person who willfully participates in the commission of a crime may be found guilty of that offense.

Now, by "intentionally," and "knowingly," we mean something very specific in
law. A person does not knowingly do an act
if his action resulted from a mistake, negligence, or any other innocent reason.

If a defendat, therefore, did not know that there was marijuana in the bales, he could not be guilty.

An act is intentional if the defendant acts voluntarily and knowingly and with the specific intent to do something the law forbids -- that is to say, with a bad purpose,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reads:

either to disobey or to disregard the law.

That means you have to look into the state of mind of these defendants, and you have to infer from the circumstances, as revealed from the evidence in the case.

The details in the indictment are approximations, but you have to find that they conform generally to what was charged.

Now, count one reads as follows:

"On or about and between the 25th day of March, 1973, and the 26th day of March, 1973, the defendants, Jose Ancisar Pineda-Marin-that is the gentleman in the green shirt --Hugo Suarez, that is the gentleman sitting next to him; Ernesto Santo Gonzalez, the man in the white suit, and Erasmus Flecha, the man in the dark jacket sitting next to him, did knowingly and intentionally import approximately 287 pounds of marijuana, a Schedule I controlled substance, into the United States from Colombia, in violation of law. That is the importation count. That charges a violation of Section 952(a) and 960(a)(1), of Title 21 of the Code, hich

"It shall be unlawful to import into the United States from anyplace outside thereof, any controlled substance in Schedule 1 of Chapter 1 of this Chapter."

Marijuana is a Schedule I control substance.

Section 960(a) provides:

"Any person who contrary to Section 952, knowingly or intentionally imports a controlled substance" shall be punishable by a felony.

There are two elements to that crime:

The defendant imported the marijuana or assisted in its importation, and

Second, that a defendant acted knowingly and intentionally, as I have explained those terms to you.

. (continued on following page)

Now, the second count is that the same people, Jose Ancisar Pineda-Marin, Hugo Suarez, Ernesto Santo Gonzales, and Erasmus Flecha, on the same dates, did knowingly and unlawfully possess with intent to distribute the same amount of marijuana.

That constitutes, if it is true, a violation of Section 841 (a) (1) of Title 21 of the United States Code which says:

"It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to possess with intent to distribute a controlled substance."

There are three elements to this crime:

First, the defendant did in fact possess

marijuana or assisted in its possession by another

defendant.

Second, in order to find the defendant guilty of violating this section you must find that he knowingly or intentionally possessed the marijuana,

Third, you must find that the defendant intended to distribute the marijuana. Distribute means to deliver and deliver has a simple clear

.

meaning. It means to transfer. If they intended to throw it over the ship's rail in order to have somebody else pick it up, that would be a delivery or distribution.

Count three of the indictment is the conspiracy count. The charge is that: "On the same dates, Hose Ancisar Pineda-Marin, Hugo Suarez, Ernesto Santo Gonzales, Erasmus Flecha and now the fifth of the defendants Moises Banguera, knowingly, unlawfully and intentionally did conspire to import into the United States from Colombia approximately 287 pounds of marijuana, and knowingly possessed with the intent to distribute approximately 287 pounds of marijuana, a schedule one controlled substance, etc."

A conspiracy of this kind constitutes a violation of Section 846 and 963 of Title 21 of the United States Code which reads:

"Any person who conspires to commit any offense defined in this subchapter is guilty of the crime of conspiracy" and under these sections the elements of the crime are:

First, that there be two or more persons

involved.

3

2

-

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Second, that they wilfully and knowingly conspire or agree, and

Third, that they conspire to commit an unlawful act.

The unlawful act obviously being the importation and possession of the marijuana.

Let me explain those elements of the conspiracy count. You must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants wilfully conspired or agreed that one of them or his agent would import marijuana or possess marijuana with the intent to distribute it. If you do not find that there was such an agreement, then you cannot find a conspiracy existed. You must first consider whether there was a knowing and wilful agreement among at least two defendants. It is not necessary that the persons charged met together and entered into an express and formal agreement, or that they stated orally or in writing what the scheme was or how it was to be effected. It is sufficient to show that they came to a mutual understanding to accomplish the unlawful act.

The Government must show beyond a reasonable

and that the defendant wilfully participated in the unlawful crime with the intent to advance or further some object or purpose of the conspiracy. That agreement may be inferred from the circumstances and the conduct of the parties, since ordinarily a conspiracy is characterized by secrecy and they do not enter into it openly. Nevertheless, suspicion alone cannot be a substitute for evidence.

To be a member of a conspiracy the defendant does not have to know all the details or participate in all of them. Each member of the conspiracy may perform separate and distinct acts. It is necessary, however, that the Government prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant was aware of the common purpose and that the common purpose was criminal in nature and that the defendant was a willing and knowing participant with the intent to advance the purposes of the conspiracy.

The third element you must find is that the conspiracy was one to commit an unlawful act and I have already told you that the importation

. 7

of marijuana or the possession of marijuana, with intent to distribute, is an illegal act and I have analyzed the nature of that for you.

A difficult part of your job is to evaluate the credibility of the witnesses you heard. You can consider the relationship of the witness to the Government, his bias or his interest in the outcome of the case, his manner while he was testifying, he candor, his intelligence as you observed it and the extent to which he has been corroborated by other evidence.

If you think a witness has wilfully sworn falsely before you with respect to a material element, you can ignore his testimony completely.

But, of course, he may have been mistaken or lied with respect to some of what he said and be accurate with respect to other elements. Do not give any greater weight or credence to the testimony of a witness merely because he is an agent of the Government. His testimony is to be evaluated in the same way you would evaluate the testimony of any other witness.

You are entitled to have your own opinions, but you should exchange views with your fellow

jurors and listen carefully to each other. If
you are convinced that another opinion is correct,
you should change your opinion. But your
opinion ultimately must be your own. Any verdict
must be unanimous. Your oaths sum up your duty
and that is, without fear or favor to any man,
you will well and truly try the issues before
these parties according to the evidence given
to you in Court and the laws of the United
States.

You may take as long as you wish to deliberate. If you do not finish tonight, you may come back tomorrow. No rush, take as much time as you want.

May I see you at the side bar?

(The following transpired at the side bar.)

THE COURT: Any objections?

MR. NOVIS: In view of the fact that

Mr. Pattison said that they did not have a camera

because of the flash, I think that you ought to

charge the jury that there are cameras that

could have taken a picture without any illumination.

THE COURT: I am not a camera bug.

MR. NOVIS: He admits it.

;

(The following transpired in open Court.)
THE CLERK: Marked Court's exhibit 12

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I want the two alternates to leave. Thank you very much. Do not discuss the case until we are finished.

You are discharged. You may go home.

(Alternates leave.)

in evidence.

THE COURT: I made up this little chart which shows the names and the various charges which I can give to the foreman. It may assist you.

Swear the marshall.

(Marshall sworn.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, retire and consider your verdict. The marshall will give you paper and pencil. If you have any phone calls just write them out and the marshall will take care of it.

(Jury leaves courtroom.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, would you get some agreement on the exhibits. But them in order so if they ask for anything, we can put them in.

MR. PATTISON: Yes, your Honor.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MC CARTHY: With respect to Defendant's exhibit A, we have to cover the back.

THE COURT: There is nothing on the back that seems to be of any significance. Let it go.

MR. MC CARTEY: No problem.

I also have a couple of questions.

First of all, I respectfully inquire of the Court whether your Honor has received the first portion of the wiretaps that Assistant District Attorney La Russo was supposed to deposit with the Court.

THE COURT: I have not.

Would the Government attorney investigate that and see if that could be expedited?

MR. PATTISON: I did not catch the last part?

THE COURT: The first part of the wiretaps we do not have.

MR. PATTISON: Yes.

MR. MC CARTHY: Secondly, if your Honor recalls we had a question as to the motion to suppress in view of the testimony of Agent Grieco with respect to actions he took in response

to an anonymous phone call. We have not resolved that.

THE COURT: I understand what you want me to do about it. Do you want me to call any witnesses?

MR. MC CARTHY: I don't want to call witnesses. There should be some testimony.

THE COURT: He testified he does not know anything about it.

MR. MC CARTHY: That is information which was the result of what was marked Government's exhibit 4.

THE COURT: I know. You know all the leads. Tell the Government who you want and we will hold a hearing.

MR. BRACKLEY: He testified in the Grand Jury that it was an anenymous phone call.

THE COURT: What does he know about it?

It wasn't his information. If you want to call

Agent Gricco, we will hear him.

MR. BRACKLEY: It will take a minute.

THE COURT: Call him.

MR. PATTISON: Now? A note may come out and I think --

•

BS fls.

THE CCURT: I can handle it.

Mr. Grieco, would you mind taking the stand?

MR. MC CARTHY: There is one other thing.

I know the marshalls have been sworn. I have
seen a couple of the jurors walking out in the
halls during recesses. I wish we could make
sure they are not walking around. My client is
in jail --

THE COURT: No juror will walk around in the hall after the marshalls have sworm. No juror leaves that room without my permission, unless he is carried out.

Excuse me, I will be back in a moment. (Recess taken.)

(contined on next page)

Take 7; pm #1 BS/elc 2

JOHN GRIECO, having previously been duly sworn, resumes the stand and testifies further as follows:

THE CLERK: You have been previously sworn. You are still under oath.

THE COURT: Who wants to examine the

agent?

MR. McCARTHY: I will, Judge.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCCARTHY:

Agent Grieco, I believe you testified at the motion to suppress that your surveillance of the ship and the operations as a result of the surveillance of the ship were based upon the information contained in Government's Exhibit 4; is that correct?

A Yes.

And solely upon that information; is that correct?

A Memorandum.

I show you your testimony in the grand jury, page 9, the top portion of the page.

I ask you, does that refresh your recollection as to whether you had any other information that led you to place the surveillance upon the ship?

Grieco-direct

I had no other information, other than the memo, and if you would like me to explain this paragraph to you, I will.

Q Yes, please.

,

.15

A Approximately eight months ago, either the ADRIANA or the ANNA MOLINA (phonetic), a vessel of the same line, had docked at State Pier. My office was called in the morning by the customs inspector, that there were many objects floating in the water up the Gowanus Channel, and in fact out in the harbor.

The men from my office went down and obtained a small boat, just for the expedient search, and came up with piles or bundles of marijuana floating in the water.

That afternoon or that morning, and all afternoon, we searched, my office did, with a Coast Guard boat, and rounded up somewhere in the vicinity of 50 packages that were just floating in the water.

Late that afternoon I had received a call from my office, anonymous, mentioning possibly that a diver was going to be used. It ended right there.

The evening of March 26, when I heard that the diver, or person, had gone in the water, it refreshed my memory of an operation where divers would be used. And that's the reference to this answer.

In other words, your testimony is that that anonymous phone call took place approximately seven months prior to the time that the ship was in port; is that right?

A Right. No relationship to this case.

Were there any other anonymous phone calls with regards to the FRANCISCO MIGUEL or any other ships of the Calva Pores Line, say, after the first of this year?

A I'm not aware of any, and I did not receive any.

MR. McCARTHY: I have no further questions.

MR. NOVIS: Your Honor, in view of the fact that your Honor is not taking judicial notice of the fact that there are cameras that can photograph in the nighttime, without any illumination, I want to ask this witness if he knows of his own knowledge that such cameras do exist.

THE COURT: What difference does it make? The evidence is closed.

MR. PATISON: I object.

MR. NOVIS: Yes, but then you might still instruct the jury that the statement made by the prosecutor is not correct.

THE COURT: Your motion to reopen the

evidence is denied. It's too late.

MR. NOVIS; Exception.

THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen or madame?

MR. DRACKLEY: Can I just see the minutes for a second?

MR. PATTISON: I have no questions.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, we marked the requests for telephone calls as Court Exhibit 13.

The request for food is part of Court's Exhibit 13.

(So marked.)

THE COURT: No further evidence. The suppression hearing is closed. Motion to suppress on the grounds of anonymous phone calls is denied.

(Recess.)

(continued on following page)

Take Spm #1 HS/elc 2

THE CLERK: Jury note marked Court's Exhibit 14.

THE COURT: Have you examined the last note, which is now marked Court's Exhibit 14? What is your advice?

HR. PATTISON: I would ask that the Court read Title XXI, Section --

THE COURT: Title XXI, Section 951, the term importation means any bringing into or introduction of such article into any area.

MR. PATTISON: It is further defined, customs area -- importing into the customs area from a place outside the area. I think it is 952.

THE COURT: Import into the customs territory.

What is the defendant's advice?

MR. McCARTHY: Your Honor, as far as
Mr. Suarez is concerned, may we have the statute
read, but I would ask that the importation be
defined to mean importation into the United
States, and not the customs territory, in view
of the indictment, which says the United States

and does not mention the customs territory.

MR. BRACKLEY: I do not have any objection to the definition given to the jury. I think they have a chart with three columns. The first one says, "Importation," et cetera. They ought to be told the gist of the first is importation, the gist of the second -- that is what the heading represents.

THE COURT: Get the dictionary, please.

MR. NOVIS: May it please the Court--

THE COURT: Importation means bringing into a country. Here it means bringing into the United States. Anyone helping to transport goods from outside the three-mile limit into the dock area will be importing. The act of importation continues until the object is taken off the boat.

MR. PATTISON: No, your Honor, it goes even further --

THE COURT: We do not have toworry about that.

MR. PATTISON: I think we do.

MR. NOVIS: I object to that definition on the grounds it does not include the words,

THI MR.

"knowing it is marijuana."

THE COURT: That is notwhat they have asked for. Let us concentrate on one thing.

Do you have any objection to the definition of importation?

MR. NOVIS: Yes.

THE COURT: What is it?

MR. NOVIS: I believe there can be no definition of importation without specifying, "knowing that it is contraband or marijuana."

THE COURT: All right, I will add that.
Anything else?

Bring in the jury.

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: The question you posed is, "What constitutes importation?"

Importation means bringing into a country. Here it means bringing into the United States. Anyone hoping to transport goods from outside the three-mile limit -- that is the area three miles from the coast -- into the dock area by ship, would be importing. The act of importation continues until the object is taken off the boat. The

1 1

...

importation would have been with knowledge, that it is marijuana. Thank you.

(Jury leaves courtroom.)

(continued on following page)

Take 9pm 1 DDS/elc (The following occurred at 7:30 o'clock p.m.) 3 4 of the jury) 5 tomorrow. I can't be here in the morning. 6 7 NR. PATTISON: Two o'clock, your 8 Honor. 9 THE COURT: We have a note. 10 Bring in the jury. 11 12 at 7:30. 13 14 note. 15 16 17 courtroom at 7:35 o'clock p.m.) 18 THE COURT: All right, ladies and 19 gentlemen, you are released for the evening. 20 Will you be here at two o'clock tomerow? I 21 can't be here in the morning. And I prefer 22 to be here while you are deliberating. 23 24 with anybody at home, or anybody here until 25

(The following occurred in the absence THE COURT: We will start at two c'clock Mark it. Just says they want to leave THE CLERK: Court Exhibit 15, Jury's (Document referred to, being a jury note, was received and marked Court's Exhibit 15.) (The jury thereupon returned to the Two o'clock. Do not discuss the case

•

all of you are assembled together.

Good night. Pleasant evening.

Do any of you want any help getting to the subway or anything? Do you want an escort from the marshal, or something like that?

JUROR NUMBER ELEVEN: We are all going in the same direction.

THE COURT: All right. If you want any help, let me know.

Good night. I will see you tomorrow.

(The jury thereupon retired from the courtroom.)

(Thereupon at 7:40 o'clock p.m., an adjournment was taken to Wednesday, May 2nd, 1973, at two o'clock p.m.)

* * * * *

PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

(2:30 p.m.)

THE COURT: Mark the note.

THE CLERK: Court Exhibit 16.

THE COURT: I understand that you have all agreed that the jury wants pages 321 to 353 read excluding the side bar from 348 to 349; is that correct?

MR. PATTISON: Your Honor, there is one other point we have learned since. The first half of this deals with the men on the end of the actual pier. But then the agent further testified to observations made on the actual ship itself.

ship. The bulk of the cross-examination dealt with that also, what he saw on the actual ship.

Now, the note does not seem to call for that portion of that agent's testimony.

THE COURT: Let's read what you agreed on and see if that satisfies them.

MR. PATTISON: That includes more than what they ask for.

THE COURT: Please give me line and page numbers.

PATTISON: Mr. McCarthy and I couldn't make that out.

MR. McCARTHY: The note seems ambiguous about that. I will check the record.

THE COURT: What do you want read?

MR. McCARTHY: I don't want anything unless they are asking for it.

THE COURT: Excuse me. We have a note here. What do you wish me to tell the jury in response to this note?

MR. McCARTHY: The way I read the note -THE COURT: I ask you what do you want
me to read to the jury in response to their note.
I want specific pages and line numbers.

MR. McCARTHY: I can't tell if they are asking about my client or not.

THE COURT: What do you want me to do with response to the note?

MR. McCARTHY: I wou ask them whether they want the testimony with regard to the people on the ship.

THE COURT: I am going to answer on the basis of the note. What does the Government want?

MR. PATTISON: I would ask, my copy of
the record was here a second ago, I believe. One
of the other lawyers has it. I would ask for
that part of the record beginning at page 321
going up to where I asked the agent about whether
he observed anyone on the actual ship itself.
Because prior to that it deals --

THE COURT: What page and what line?

MR. PATTISON: I believe the Court may
have a copy of the record which I can't find.

From 321 up to line 22 of page 330.

MR. HALLINA: Excluding all the colloquy.

MR. PATTISON: And the only cross --

THE COURT: I don't want explanations, I just want page and line numbers from you so I know what you want.

MR. FATTISON: From 321 to 330 and then -THE COURT: Line 20 on 330?

MR. PATTISON: Yes. And then page 349 from line 19 to page 353.

THE COURT: Line what?

MR. PATTISON: All of the actual page.

THE COURT: All right. Do any defense counsel want any other portion by line and page

read?

MR. HALLINAN: No, I think that answers the question.

MR. McCARTHY: I don't.

THE COURT: Very good. Bring in the jury.

The reporter will read those materials as requested by counsel.

(The jury is in the jury box.)

THE COURT: Mark this new note we just received from the jury as it walked in.

THE CLERK: Court Exhibit 17.

THE COURT: It says, "Suarez testimony."

I don't understand what you want.

THE FOREMAN: Agent Grieco's testimony concerning Mr. Suarez.

THE COURT: Let me read the other note.

The note says, "May we have the testimony of
the two men at end of pier. One crouched

(tugboat testimony and grain elevator testimony)."

Now, I am now going to direct the reporter to read what we think you want. When you have heard enough read, let us know. Then we will release you and look for the testimony you say you want of Grieco respecting Suarez and we will

,

call you in again.

The reporter will commence to read.

(At this time the reporter commenced reading the designated portion.)

THE FOREMAN: The agent was on the tugboat --

MR. HALLINAN: May we approach the side bar?

THE CCJRT: I wish you would. I want exactly what counsel wishes in this respect.

(The following took place at side bar.)

MR. PATTISON: Line 21 is what I asked for.

MR. McCARTHY: The guy on the tugboat was --

MR. PATTISON: The two men --

MR. HALLINAN: We are confused.

MR. PATTISON: May we just say to them now, or would the Court say that Agent Weinschenk was a witness about the men on the pier. Agent Maurer was on the tuyboat and saw the men coming through.

MR. HALLINAN: Don't add that.

MR. PATTISON: Do they want either --

THE COURT: Weinschenk was on the boat?

25

MR. PATTISON: No, in the grain elevator and he saw the men crouching on the pier.

(The following took place in open court.)

THE COURT: Do you want Agent Weinschenk's testimony? He was the one that was in the grain elevator and watched them crouching.

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

(The following took place at side bar.)

MR. PATTISON: 321 through 330.

THE COURT: It is 322, line 13. Mr. Weinschenk's testimony beginning on page 322, line 13 is apparently what counsel have agreed on.

(The following took place in open court.)

THE COURT: The reporter will commence reading.

(The reporter complied with the instructions of the Court.)

THE FOREMAN: That is enough, your Honor.

THE COURT. Can you allow the jury to retire for a few moments?

MR. PATTISON: Yes.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Why don't you look at the

transcript together.

MR. PATTISON: Your Monor --

THE COURT: Where is Mr. McCarthy? Where are the attorneys and the Interpreter? I haven't left the beach.

MR. McCARTHY: I apologize for leaving.
I don't have a set of minutes.

THE COURT: They are right here. You have a set right there.

MR. PATTISCN: Your Fonor, there was one part of the testimony left out. The testimony about --

THE COURT: The jury was satisfied. Let's move on.

MR. PATTISCN: It is a very critical part and I am sure they want all of it.

THE COURT: The jury told me they were satisfied. I want to move on. I want Mr. Grieco's testimony with respect to Suarez.

MR. PATTISON: Very well. I will look for it.

THE COURT: For the record, tell me what it is.

MR. PATTISON: Just page 346 through line 12,

24

23

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McCARTHY: 194, to line 22. To 196, Page 200, line 21 to page 202, line 13. Page 204, line 25 to page 206, line 9.

.17

 Page 208, line 15 to page 210, line 5.

MR. PATTISON: Your Honor, may I at this time be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PATTISON: I would again ask the Court that in light of the jury's first note when the Court asked me for page and line numbers, I, through my own fault, left out those 12 lines which I asked the Court about later. The jury indicated that they had heard enough only after that which had been read, read up to them, stops being read --

MR. HALLINAN: I object. It was improper redirect.

MR. PATTISON: The Court ruled upon it.

THE COURT: Get the record.

MR. HALLINAN: In the record --

MR. PATTISON: It is page --

MR. HALLINAN: I object. These are the questions he left out on direct, try to play cute, and then --

MR. PATTISON: Page 346, line 12 to page 347, line 15.

MR. HALLINAN: Would your Honor read it?

24

25

It is brief, and you can see.

MR. PATTISON: I think it is critical in light of their note.

MR. HALLINAN: It is exactly what was said on direct. It is an unfair re-emphasis.

MR. PATTISON: No, it is not.

THE COURT: Let me have the transcript between 172 and 210 so I may mark it for the reporter.

Mark this further note.

THE CLERK: Court Exhibit 18.

MR. PATTISON: Does the Court have a copy -- from 175, yes, all right.

THE COURT: Show this to counsel while I mark the transcript.

THE CLERK: Can the attorneys come up.

THE COURT: What is it marked?

THE CLERK: Court Exhibit 18, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am handing to the reporter material beginning on page 172 with a clip at the top of the page and marking thereafter where to begin and where to stop.

MR. PATTISON: Your Honor, Mr. McCarthy has just located one other part of the record.

MR. McCARTHY: Page 199, line 19.

THE COURT: To where?

MR. McCARTHY: To page 200, line 21, which your Honor has as the beginning of another passage.

In other words, that passage would be page 199, line 18 to page 202, line 13.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you.

THE COURT: What is the definition you want me to give of possession?

MR. PATTISON: All I would ask for is the two actual types, actual possession and constructive possession.

of possession; actual possession and constructive possession. A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it. This is true even if the physical control is only momentary. A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another

person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it. The law recognizes also that possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

MR. PATTISON: That would be adequate for me.

MR. HALLINAN: Yes.

MR. NOVIS: What was the last word?

THE COURT: "Joint."

MR. McCARTHY: I have no objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Bring in the jury.

MR. PATTISON: May I ask you, please, again to read those 12 lines? I think if it were not read, I am sure if I had asked for those lines --

THE COURT: I know. I would have surely read it.

MR. PATTISON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Bring in the jury.

(The jury is in the jury box.)

THE COURT: We will read to you the testimony we located with respect to Suarez. Do you
want me first to read some other testimony that
one of the counsel has found connected with the
prior testimony or have you had enough of that?

THE FOREMAN: You mean the prior one?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE FOREMAN: We have had enough of that.

THE COURT: Then read the testimony I just indicated.

(The reporter complied.)

THE COURT: Is that enough?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: You asked about the definition of possession.

"The law recognizes two kinds of possession; actual possession and constructive possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it. This is true even if the physical control is only momentary.

"A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to exercise dominion

or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

"The law recognizes also that possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint."

If you have a truckload of cartons, let's say, and I call the trucker and I say: Those are the cartons I want delivered, and I have the power to deliver them, I would be in possession of them even though I wasn't actually there present because I would have the power to exercise dominion or control over them.

If the driver and the assistant knew they were the cartons there and knew what was in there, each one of them would also have possession and control. If there were people unloading them and they knew what was in there, they also would have possession and control.

You can have a considerable number in possession or control over a variety of times over

the same cartons.

If there is somebody helping the truck back in, and he knows what is in them and he says: Back in there, or don't back way down here, he would also be in possession and control of them.

He has to know what is in them. And he has to have some power, either himself or with somebody else, to move them around.

Any objections or exceptions? Do you gentlemen and mrd ... want to make any objections at side bar?

MR. McCARTHY: No, your Honor.

MR. PATTISON: No.

THE COURT: You may retire then and consider your verdict.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

25

We had them all over there at this time.

Q O.K. At this time was anything said? Did
you overhear anybody say anything?

A We were standing there. The captain was sent for to identify these five individuals. He came down. He identified them, the two, as crew members, the other three he didn't know who they were.

We had them standing in line. I was standing next to Mr. Gonzales and Mr. Flecha. Mr. Muniz was standing next to me, and somebody was talking to the captain at this time, and Mr. Gonzales made a statement in Spanish, in which I am fluent, I am a native of Fuerto Rico, that is my home --

Q What did he say?

A Mr. Gonzales said, in fact, translated in English, he said, "Why so much excitement? If we are caught, we are caught."

(Continued on the next page.)

1	Cabrera - direct 366
2	Q Did you actually ask him anything? Was this
. 3	an actual answer to any question?
4	A It wasn't any answer to my question. He appeared.
5	to be talking to Mr. Flecha, who was next to him at the time.
6	Q well.
7	* MR. HALLINAN: Your Honor, at this time
8	I am going to ask an instruction from the Court
9	that the statement is not binding at all on
10	the defendant Banguera.
11	MR. McCARTHY: Same with regard to
12	Mr. Suarez.
13	. MRS. SEYBERT: I also join in that on
14	behalf of Mr. Pineda.
15	THE COURT: Granted.
16	MR. NOVIS: I join in that application,
17	your Honor.
18	THE COURT: As to whom?
19	MR. NOVIS: As to Mr. Flecha.
20	THE COURT: Where was Mr. Flecha standing
21	when Gonzales said it?
22	THE WITNESS: He was right next to him, sir.
23	THE COURT: How far away?
24	THE WITNESS: Oh, six inches, twelve

inches.

THE COURT: Denied as to Mr. Flecha.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

april 9, 1976

I certify that a copy of this brief and appendix has been mailed to the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York.

Snatfay Selbermans